

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### Examiner's first rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haines (US 1,894,173). The Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection, as noted below.

Applicant notes the Examiner's arguments in paragraph 3 of the Office Action, but believes that they are irrelevant in light of the fact that the structure of the Haines prior art reference is not what the Examiner claims it to be. Specifically, in paragraph 4, the Examiner "claims" the following similarities:

- (1) "...the lens comprising four separate segments..."

It is quite clear in the Haines prior art reference that there are five separate segments that could be defined as a lens – one central piece and four pieces surrounding the central piece. The central piece is numbered as a "5" and the four surrounding pieces as a "9," but this does not change the fact that they all have the same characteristics.

- (2) "...the two larger segments being front-mounted in a "gull-winged" aerodynamic shape...."

Which two larger segments? And furthermore, it is quite apparent that all five of the "lens" on the Haines prior art reference are on a cover panel that appears to be flat, not "gull-winged."

- (3) "...the two smaller segments being side-mounted..."

As previously stated, it is quite apparent that all five of the "lens" on the Haines prior art reference are on a cover panel that appears to be flat, not "gull-winged." Therefore, they can not be "side-mounted."

(4) "a pair of compartments..." [located within the housing]

Upon further review, it appears that there is either only one compartment within the housing or four compartments within the housing. It is not clear if the "barrier walls" placed between each of the lights actually are tall enough to physically separate the internal area within the housing into four separate compartments when the front cover panel is on. If they do, then there would be four separate compartments. If they do not, it is apparent from a review of the structural ar disclosed in the Haines prior art reference that there is only one compartment within the housing.

(5) "...a pair of interior reflector compartments..."

Applicant fails to see where these are located on the Haines prior art reference.

As can be seen, there are several structural dissimilarities between the Haines prior art reference and the present invention. Therefore, it is clear that Haines does not anticipate claim 1 of the present invention.

Claims 5 and 7 are directly derivative of claim 1. As claims that are derivative of claims that are believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 5 and 7 also is in condition for allowance due to the fact that they contain all limitations inherent in the base claim. Therefore, applicant believes he has traversed this rejection as well for claims 5 and 7.

Examiner's second rejection:


The Examiner has rejected claims 2-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haines (US 1,894,173). The Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection, as noted below.

As the Applicant has presented a fairly strong argument for the claim that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, claims 2-4 and 6, as claims that are either directly or indirectly derivative of claim 1, are also believed to be in condition for allowance. As claims that are derivative of claims that are believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 5 and 7 also is in condition for allowance due to the fact that they contain all limitations inherent in the base claim. Therefore, applicant believes he has traversed this rejection as well for claims 2-4 and 6.

## CONCLUSION

For all of the above-described reasons, applicant submits that the specifications and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims define patentability over the prior art. In addition, applicants believe that her arguments in the "Remarks" section successfully traverses the objections and rejections brought forth by the Examiner in the Office Action. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action she respectfully solicits. If the Examiner feels that some of the dependent claims are allowable, the Applicant asks the Examiner to allow the Applicant to make any amendments to the allowed claims to incorporate all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Respectfully Submitted,



Matthew J. Peirce, Esq.  
Registration No. #41,245  
Attorney for Inventor Frank Fellhauer